

## **REMARKS**

The Office rejects claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 15, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, 32, and 37 in the subject application. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 8, 11, 15, 18, 21, 25, 28 and 37 are amended, and claims 10 and 27 are cancelled. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 18, 21, 23, 25-26, 28-30, 32, and 36-37 (6 independent claims; 19 total claims) remain pending in the application. Support for the various amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication in the Office Action that claims 8, 9, 25, 26, and 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have accordingly amended claims 8 and 25 to create independent claims and to respectively include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depended. Claims 9, 26, and 36 variously depend from amended claims 8 and 25. Thus, Applicants assert that claims 8, 9, 25, 26, and 36 are allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10-12, 15, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Porter et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,230,559 ("Porter"). Applicants traverse the rejections. Applicants note that with the cancellation of claims 10 and 27, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the phone conferences last week in which the Examiner, on February 27, 2004, indicated that claim 1 would be allowable with the proposed amendments that were discussed. Applicants have amended claim 1 as proposed. In the phone conference with the Examiner, Applicants noted that, Porter does not disclose a lid as recited in amended claim 1. The amendments to claim 1 are supported in the specification. See, e.g., paragraphs 29, 35 and 46.

Thus, Applicants submit that each and every element of amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Porter. Accordingly claim 1 (and claims 2, 6, and 11-12 which variously depend from claim 1) is not anticipated by Porter and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 6, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Applicants have similarly amended claim 18 to include the amendments made to claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that each and every element of amended independent claim 18 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Porter. Accordingly, claim 18 (and claims 21, 23, 28-30, and 32 which variously depend from claim 18) is not anticipated by Porter and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18, 21, 23, 28-30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter. Applicants have similarly amended claim 37 to include the amendments made in claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that each and every step of amended independent claim 37 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Porter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicants note that the above described amendments to claims 1 and 18 introduced to those claims the pour collar element that had existed in some defendant claims. Thus, claims 10 and 27 were cancelled and a portion of claims 11 and 28 were deleted to avoid redundancy. Similarly, the above amendment to claim 18 moved the introduction of the lid element from claim 21 to claim 18, and thus, claim 21 was slightly amended to conform the antecedent basis.

Lastly, claim 15 has been amended as discussed with the Examiner on February 27, 2004 to additionally recite, “and wherein the lamp and the reflector are within the lamp fixture body.” See paragraph 37 of the specification. Claim 15 was also rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 from which it depended. As discussed with the Examiner, Porter merely discloses a stripped down lamp fixture (14) having a lamp (bulb 16) and a reflector (the bowl shaped object with bare wires attached). Porter does not additionally disclose a lamp body around the reflector and the lamp where the lamp body has a base, a cap and an o-ring.

Therefore, Applicants submit that each and every element of amended independent claim 15 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Porter. Accordingly, claim 15 is not anticipated by Porter and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102.



Applicants note that although they disagree with the Examiner's characterization of various elements of the Porter reference, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the application, and further in view of Examiner's indication that the claims as amended are allowable, Applicants do not individually address the characterizations of various elements of the Porter reference.

### Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 11-12, 15, 18, 21, 23, 25-26, 28-30, 32, and 36-37 properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (602)382-6367 at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.

Dated: March 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By

John H. Platt  
Reg. No. 47,863

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Telephone: (602) 382-6367  
Facsimile: (602) 382-6070